DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 459 534 EA 031 484

AUTHOR Andrews, Richard; Grogan, Margaret
TITLE Defining Preparation and Professional Development for the Future.
PUB DATE 2002-02-00
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation (1st, Racine, WI, February 7-9, 2001).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Education; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership Styles; *Principals; *Professional Development; *Superintendents

ABSTRACT

This paper reports on the current thinking about the position of principal and superintendent in America's schools. The positions of school principal and district superintendent have been undergoing changes in definition and scope over the last century and a half. As America undergoes significant societal transformation, the definition of these two positions has to evolve to meet the complex demands the country puts on its schools. The history of the development of the principalship and superintendency is given to provide context for the challenges aspiring education leaders will face in the new millennium. A noted systemic problem in higher education is the inability of many universities to provide adequate instruction relevant to today's leadership needs in education. Recommendations include leadership preparation programs being redesigned to reflect collaborative instructional leadership that works through transformational processes. Such programs must be organized around problems of practice and delivered in collaboration with practitioners. Developmental evaluation processes need to be contained to assess aspiring leaders based upon their level of development. Programs should have a critical mass of five to six faculty devoted to the preparation of new forms of leadership for the schools. (Contains 51 references.)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 459 534

Defining Preparation and Professional Development for the Future

Richard Andrews
University of Missouri

Margaret Grogan
University of Virginia
mgrogan@virginia.edu

Paper Commissioned for the First Meeting of the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation.

"Ensuring Universities' Capacity to Prepare Learning Focused Leadership"
Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, Wisconsin, February 7-9, 2002.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. L. Willis

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

EA031484

Defining Preparation and Professional Development for the Future

Richard Andrews and Margaret Grogan

This paper reports on the current thinking about the position of principal and superintendent in America's schools. The two positions are treated separately until the Recommendations section in which common issues pertaining to future preparation programs are addressed.

The Principalship

Introduction. The school principal as a formal role in the American schooling system followed the formation of the Department of Elementary School Principals and the Department of Secondary School Principals within the National Education Association during the 1920s. As a result of the formal recognition of the role of the principal, university-based training programs began training aspiring principals. Today some 500 university-based training programs have been developed to prepare aspiring principals and to produce a ready supply of new talent for school leadership positions. However, in spite of the efforts, it is not uncommon to hear that there is a shortage of aspiring principals being certified to become school principals. This appears not to be the case.

According to the Consortium for Educational Policy at the University of Missouri, the number of aspiring principals produced from these programs is estimated to be twice to three times the number of job vacancies. However, it is the considered judgment of superintendents and those who closely follow this issue that there is a shortage of

"qualified" candidates available. It is projected that the shortage of "qualified" candidates available to fill vacancies may be as high as 55% for high school and middle school vacancies and 47% for elementary school vacancies. Of those who accept positions, there also appears to be a 45-55% attrition rate of principals over an eight-year period of time with the largest amount of attrition occurring during the first three years on the job. Those who are prepared are less likely to seek principalships in urban and remote rural districts. Some argue it is how we choose to operate schools that is the problem (Elmore, 1999). However, according to data collected by the Consortium, the shortage of qualified candidates seems to be attributed to three factors: (1) the nature of the job, (2) salary not sufficient to warrant the risks and personal time to assume the position, and (3) lack of mobility of candidates to accept jobs that are open. Whatever the cause, clearly we need to find a way to increase the supply and distribution of qualified candidates for school-site leadership at all levels.

As a starting point it might serve us to briefly examine the historical roots of the various conceptions of the role of the principal as a basis for how programs might be designed to prepare principals for the challenges of 21st –century schools. Beck and Murphy (1993) have traced the broad, historical development of the principalship by examining its evolution through the decades since its formal recognition. In addition to the management and orderly focus of the role of the principal, each decade seemed as well to present a special focus of the principalship. The principalship of the 1920s was focused primarily upon a values-based concern with pedagogy and making sure of close connection between schools and family values. The 1930s saw a move away from a focus on values and toward an emphasis on the scientific management of schools. Due to

World War II and its aftermath, the principalship of the 1940s and the early 1950s embraced patriotic values that stressed the importance of education in a democratic and strong society. The Cold War and the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik during the late 1950s created a new focus. Schools during the 1950's and 1960's focused on academic excellence, particularly in math and the sciences, and principals focused on empirically developed strategies for management and instruction.

The growth of social problems in the 1970s, such as racial tension, substance abuse, and teen pregnancy, focused the principalship on providing a wide variety of remedies that shifted their primary focus away from academic leadership. The rise of international economic competitors in the 1980s, such as Japan, led to the issuance of the Nation at Risk report calling for schools to refocus upon academic achievement and the preparation of students for the workplace. This latest focus seems to be carrying forward to the present day, with the development and implementation of state and national standards and high stakes testing accompanying the emphasis (Lucas, 2001).

In the main, however, without regard for the particular focus, university-based programs for the training of aspiring school principals might best be characterized as preparing aspiring principals for the role of the principal as a top down building manager. The knowledge base deemed essential for principals to be prepared for these management functions has been organized around management concepts, such as, planning, organizing, financing, supervising, budgeting, scheduling, etc., rather than on the creation of relationships and environments within schools that promote student learning. The principal was more concerned with mandates, rules, regulations, and focused his/her

attention on supervision and incentives as a strategy for working with the staff in the school. In 1985, the National Commission for Excellence in Educational Administration noted that the majority of the programs did not even require a course in curriculum.

New conceptualizations. The late 1980s and 1990s marked a dramatic change in the conceptualization of the work of the school principal. The principal was no longer to be seen as a building manager but was to be seen as the instructional leader of the school. The instructional leader focus was based upon research that found that schools in which all children, and particularly poor children and children of color, showed significant increases in student achievement were guided by instructional leaders. These instructional leaders built structures of relationships in schools so that the creative human energy in the school was transformed into student performance. Smith and Andrews (1989) characterize the strong instructional leader as one who gives curriculum and instruction the highest priority; is dedicated to school and school district goals; rallies and mobilizes resources to enable the accomplishment of those goals; creates a climate of high expectations and respect; is directly involved in instructional policy through communication, staff development, establishing incentives for use of new instructional strategies, and displaying knowledge of curricular materials; monitors student progress and teacher effectiveness; is committed to strong academic achievement goals; and consults effectively with faculty and other groups when making decisions.

Changes in the nature of principal preparation programs have been slow to follow this change in the conceptualization of the work of the principal. This change in perspective focused on the principals' role in the improvement of instruction and value

adding to the performance of students. The emphasis on instructional leadership was qualitatively different from the preceding conceptualizations of the principalship, all of which were essentially managerial in nature. However, the emergence of an increasingly competitive international economic reality, combined with rapidly changing social conditions in the United States—particularly changing family and student demographic characteristics—has caused many educators to speculate that the strict conceptualization of the principal as the only instructional leader in the school may be inadequate for today's changing contexts. As a result, the role definition for the school principal has become increasingly problematic due to the changing nature of the tasks before him or her (Daresh, Gantner, Dunlap, & Hvizdak, 2000).

The general consensus that the present system of American education is not sufficient for meeting the needs of today's society and its students has caused educators to reexamine both the larger system itself and all of its component parts and functions, including our conceptualization of school leadership. Perhaps the greatest structural change has been the move to site-based management and away from district and state offices, along with a shift from the idea of the principal as the sole, hierarchical leader of the school and toward the idea of shared, collaborative forms of principal leadership (Hallinger, 1992, Lucas, 2001). These new forms of leadership do not call for the principal to abandon the focus on learning and instruction but to engage in expanding the leadership team or engaging in what Elmore (1999) refers to as distributed leadership. This view of leadership is at the heart of efforts such as the Milken Foundations Teacher Advancement Program that develops new and expanded roles for teachers. There seems to be growing consensus that the processes the school leader uses must be

transformational in nature if an expanded leadership team is to work and schools are to be more successful.

Current Context. The principal today is seen as the key player in schools that are called upon to manage themselves through collaborative, pedagogical or distributed notions of leadership that focus the role of the principal as leader of an instructional team. The behavior of the school leader should be transformational and work to build a structure of relationships both inside the school and with the school community so that the creative human energy in the school is transformed into desired student performance. Behind this conceptualization of the role is the idea that the executive power of the principal is expanded, rather than reduced, through the sharing of power (Henkin, Wanat, Davis, 1996). As power is shared, then, the principal becomes a leader of leaders (Crow & Glascock, 1995) who is more coach and cheerleader than cop or boss (Alexander & Keller, 1994). More collaborative, human resource-based, developmental, based on principal-teacher, and principal-teacher interactions are characterized by inquiry, reflection, exploration, and experimentation (Blase & Blase, 1999). Instead of being focused on controlling events and people, the principal focuses on building human capital in both staff and students. Value adding to staff, by increasing both intellectual and professional capital and value adding to students in both academic and social capital (Sergiovanni, 1998) occurs by increasing the capacity of others in the organization through the facilitation of their knowledge, talents, and expertise. He or she functions as a teacher of other teachers, a steward of the vision and mission of the school, and fosters systematic patterns of thinking for what is to be taught and a repertoire of strategies for

engaging "students" and staff in meaningful learning and action oriented toward effective school change (Andrews, Berube and Basom, 1993; Short, 1994; Lucas, 2001).

Effective principals seem to be those who can assume multiple leadership roles and employ numerous strategies successfully in order to survive and thrive personally and professionally while at the same time helping their schools do the same for students and teachers (Bredeson, 1993; Griffith, 1999). Principals in school-based management, shared decision making structures can succeed: they must be visionaries, risk-takers, facilitators, and consensus-builders. In some ways, the "science" of administration has given way to the "psychology" of administration, with an emphasis on interpersonal perspectives and a focus on the development of followers and synergy in order to improve the school's effectiveness (Amatea, Behar-Horenstein, & Sherrard, 1996). The principal value adds by identifying and articulating a vision; fostering the acceptance of group goals; providing an appropriate model; holding high performance expectations; providing individual support; providing intellectual stimulation; supplying contingent reward; performing management by exception; culture building; and structuring (Leithwood, Tomlinson, & Genge, 1996, Smith and Andrews, 1989). Included in this notion of school leader behavior is the creation and management of tensions, the development of shared visions, the generation and taking advantage of opportunities, the development of new leaders and leadership structures, the spanning of internal and external organizational boundaries, the creation of readiness for change, the balancing of decision making processes and products, the making of careful choices in order to conserve organizational energy, the delineation of areas of responsibility, and the creation

of systems that support the facilitative role of the principal for the long term (Conley & Goldman, 1994).

In this more facilitative exercise of leadership, principals exert influence through the organization's purposes, goals, structure, social networks, people, and culture (Hallinger & Heck, 1998). This influence is more collegial and organic than rational, mechanistic, managerial, or bureaucratic (Marshall, Patterson, Rogers, & Steele, 1996). It comes from linking significant human values to ethically and morally uplifting leadership and management practices that create new beliefs and actions about school governance, organization, relationships, and learning (Duignan & Bhindi, 1997).

While each of these views of the principal differ to some degree, they each represent a dramatic departure from the view of the principal as a building manager to principal as instructional leader focused on the teaching and learning processes within schools. They demand that the academy re-conceptualize both the knowledge basis and the processes that are included in university-based programs for aspiring principals.

There is some evidence that a number of programs have re-conceptualized the knowledge base and changed the structure of the program, noteworthy is the work done by the Danforth Foundation over a number of years in collaboration with selected universities throughout the country (Murphy, 1995; Milstein, 1993). However, the common perception of those outside the academy is that the order of the day is more of the same. For example, in a recent article Vincent Ferrandino, Executive Director of the National Elementary School Principals Association, (2001) set forth similar expectations for the role of the school principal. He raised serious doubts about current university-

based programs ability to produce these kinds of principal preparation programs when he noted:

> "To meet the many challenges they will face in the next decade, 21st-century principals will need to develop skills and strategies that aren't taught in graduate school. Perhaps the most critical of these challenges is to provide a positive learning environment for a highly diverse student population" (p. 441)

Ferrandino is not alone in his conclusions about the needs of the 21st century principal and the inadequacy of university-based preparation programs to produce principals with different knowledge and skills. Gerald Tirozzi, Executive Director of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (2001) recently noted that "In short, the principal engages herself or himself as an instructional leader." He went on to say that they will be "recognized as leaders of curricular change, innovative and diversified instructional strategies, data-driven decision making and the implementation of accountability models for students and staff." In order to reach this end, Tirozzi noted it would be necessary to "transform principal preparation programs in higher education—which are generally woefully lacking and often staffed by individuals who have very little, if any, experience in school leadership". (p.438)

There is some evidence to support these views. The new Interstate School Leader Licensing Consortium (ISLLC) recently developed a set of national standards in the six key areas for principal certification and evaluation seen as essential to transform our

schools. These standards are used for folio review by NCATE. These area are: 1) vision of learning; 2) school culture and instructional programs; 3) management; 4) collaboration with families and community; 5) acting with integrity, fairness, and ethics; and 6) political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.

When these standards have been used to review university-based aspiring principal preparation programs, few of the principal preparation programs in major universities have passed the folio review. If our children are to achieve new higher standards of performance, our schools and the educators within them and the programs designed to prepare these educators must change.

There is growing awareness that teachers matter and good teachers matter a lot. There is a direct link between what good teachers are able to do and the quality of the school where they teach. Further, the school principal is a key lynchpin between teacher development and school improvement. The continued preparation of aspiring principals in research university-based preparation programs is critical to creating environments in schools with an increasingly diverse population of students.

The Superintendency

Introduction. Like the principalship, the superintendency has evolved over the years. The position was established in the mid-1800s. By 1890, superintendents were found in all large cities, although small cities and towns did not have a superintendent of schools until the twentieth century (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). In its earliest conception, the position was clerical "assisting the school board with the day-to-day details of school activities" (p. 23). Gradually, superintendents assumed a more instructional focus

although the position was still task oriented. They supervised and visited schools and compiled annual reports (Brunner, Grogan & Björk, in press). By the first half of the twentieth century, the role had become associated with business management as well as instruction (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). The first training programs for superintendents were primarily concerned with the routine, technical, and business aspects of the position (Griffiths, 1966, in Brunner, Grogan & Björk, in press). Business principles and industry continued to influence the position through the post-war period. During this time, the superintendent was seen as an expert manager whose main responsibility was to ensure the efficient running of the schools. After the launch of Sputnik and the Brown decision in the 1950s however, the public became more critical of public education and the superintendent became a target for dissatisfaction (Carter & Cunningham, 1997, Brunner, Grogan & Björk, in press).

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) and the National School Boards Association (NSBA) published a pamphlet in 1968 defining an expanded position for the superintendent. Superintendents were now to be responsible for planning and evaluation; organization; management of personnel, business, buildings, and auxiliary services; provision of information and advice to the community; and coordination of the entire school system (p. 6). Instead of being expected mainly to serve the board and to carry out its policies, the superintendent of the 1970s and onwards became a much more controversial figure in public education. He or she was required to be responsive to a variety of interest groups and stakeholders that have little in common with each other. The most conspicuous feature of the position as it was reported from this period on was its politically conflictual nature (Boyd, 1974; Cuban, 1976). Blumberg

(1985) reinforced the notion of superintendent as "educational statesman" or "political strategist" or a combination of both. Superintendents were expected to engage in political maneuvering. However, public confidence in education declined further in the 1970s and the theme "for school superintendents was "accountability" (Carter & Cunningham, 1997, p. 26, quotation marks in the original). Marland (1970) called this "a new era of educational appraisal" (in Grogan, 2000, p. 122) – one that has lasted, in various different iterations for over 30 years.

In the 1980s, the era that ushered in educational reform, the pressure upon superintendents to respond to the criticism that came from all quarters increased. After the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983), not only did citizens offer suggestions and advice to educators, but there were also many mandates requiring boards, and superintendents to respond (Carter & Cunningham, 1997). "Education had entered the political arena full swing, and politicians felt compelled to make their mark on education" (p. 28). Unlike principals who were seen to be instrumental in carrying out the reforms, "superintendents were criticized by reformists as being blockers of reform" (Glass, 1997, p. 24). Drawing on Morris (1979), Kowalski (1999) argues that in contrast to managers in business, superintendents at this time paid more attention to their internal networks and subordinates than to the government agencies and civic leaders outside the school system. "The apparent insulation of the superintendent .... became a primary reform issue for those who judged school officials to be insensitive to community needs and impervious to changing economic, political and social conditions" (p. 12). Thus, the job expectations of the superintendency expanded once again to include the capacity to generate broad-based community support for whatever reform efforts were developed to increase student

achievement. And a greater emphasis was placed on the superintendent's role in instructional leadership (Björk, 1993).

The increased expectations for superintendents moving into the 1990s were accompanied by a loss of positional power. Superintendents found themselves much more at the mercy of policymakers than ever before. During this decade, state and local bureaucracies gained more control and influence over public education. One indication of this shift was President George Bush's education summit in Charlottesville, Virginia, in 1989. The President and the nation's governors met to establish national performance goals to enhance the United States' global competitiveness. The summit "was clearly a response to the perception of a rising economic challenge from highly industrialized nations" (Carter & Cunningham, 1997, p. 29). These perceptions encouraged various citizen groups to seek input into educational policymaking – interest groups whose main concerns were not education. At the same time, the charter school movement, privatization of public education services and management, and state or mayoral takeovers of school board functions also contributed to the erosion of superintendents' authority and policymaking leadership (Glass, 1997).

Most recently, the superintendency has been characterized as an enormously challenging position. Not only are superintendents impelled to look outward as the earlier criticisms suggested, but they are also expected to be knowledgeable of all facets of education within the district. Although the average tenure of a superintendent is reported to be about 7.25 years (Cooper, Fusarelli & Carella, 2000), or 5-6 years, (Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000), many urban superintendents remain only a short time in their positions. Like the principalship, it has been suggested that the superintendency is not as attractive a

position as it once was. Compensation for the position has not kept pace with similar executive positions in business and industry (Cunningham & Sperry, 2001). Superintendent stress levels are creeping up – over half the respondents in the *2000 Study of the American School Superintendency* report experiencing considerable or very great stress (Glass, Brunner & Björk, p. 99). The September, 2001 issue of *The School Administrator* highlights articles from superintendents and experts on how to deal with stress. Quoting Gmelch's research, Sternberg states that superintendents experience "physical and psychological effects, burnout, flat-out emotional exhaustion … and … depersonalization" (p. 6). To what extent have the changing conditions of the job dissuaded potential aspirants from seeking the superintendency?

The recent nation-wide studies of the superintendency report on the one hand, concerns among current superintendents of an impending "crisis" brought about by a perceived shortage of applicants (Cooper, Fusarelli & Carella, 2000, pp. 10-11), and on the other, data that show the attrition levels in the superintendency "have not changed appreciably over the past several decades" (Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000, p. 22). Most acknowledge that the evidence of a shortage of applicants is anecdotal at best. It is also complicated by reports of an increase of women in administrator preparation programs across the country (p. 15). Young (1999) criticized policy approaches used across the county to address the perceived "crisis" in the principalship because they ignored gender as a possible discriminating factor. The same could be said of the superintendency. If women account for approximately 33 percent of assistant/associate/deputy/area superintendents (Hodgkinson & Montenegro, 1999), the type of position from which most current superintendents are drawn, it is surprising that only 13.2 percent of

superintendents are women (Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000, p. 15). No hard data exist but one wonders how many women (and minorities) licensed to be superintendents are not considered qualified for reasons unrelated to knowledge and skill. Although the figures for minorities in the superintendency have also increased slightly to 5.1 percent, there is a "dramatic underrepresentation of these two groups [women and minorities] in relation to white males" (p. 15).

Preparation for the Superintendency. There has not been as much research on how superintendents have been prepared as there has been on the preparation of principals. Few universities have programs tailored specifically for the position although most PhD and EdD programs in educational administration are considered to be preparation programs for superintendents. Most states provide superintendent licensure for individuals who earn such degrees. Exceptions to the above include among others: the *Harvard Urban Superintendents Program, The University of Virginia School Superintendent's Licensure Program,* and the non-university based programs, the *Kentucky Superintendent's Leadership Development Program* developed by the Kentucky State Department of Education, the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) and AASA, and *Superintendents Prepared* created by the Urban Leadership Consortium of the Institute for Educational Leadership, Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, and the McKenzie Group Inc. More recently, Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) report on new for-profit ventures between institutions of higher education and such organizations as the College Board that are "new ways of looking at the intersection of business and education [to create] a variety of superintendent preparation programs" (p. 17). However, it is difficult to develop a comprehensive

superintendent preparation program because the position of superintendent varies considerably depending on size and location of district, and relevant state laws governing composition of school boards, scope of board and superintendent responsibilities, local fiscal responsibility and autonomy, and public meetings. Since '[t]he enrollment and complexity of a school district often are key factors in determining what superintendents actually do on a daily basis" (Kowalski, 1999, p. 12), programs must generalize to a great extent.

UCEA conducted a study of principals and superintendents, their jobs, preparation and the problems they faced in 1999. Superintendents reported that they appreciated programs that taught them essential knowledge and skills in such courses as law, finance, theory, research, systems orientation and organizational development (Bratlein & Walters, 1999). Additionally they valued skills in the area of personal attributes such as "leadership and the abilities to solve problems and make decisions" (p. 88). Respondents in this study also emphasized the worth of superintendent internships and practica to complement the intellectual stimulation received in the classroom. They also wanted to see more "practitioners as part of class sessions and discussions, … using broad-based activities to bring real life experiences into the classroom for discussion and dialogue" (p. 98). This study found that cited areas of weakness in one program were cited areas of strength in another program. Thus, no clear picture of the strong points or shortcomings of typical preparation programs emerged. Respondents were not overly critical of their programs.

Similarly, Glass, Björk and Brunner (2000) report that two-thirds of the superintendents in their study believed their preparation programs to be "good" (p. 127).

This seems to contradict the prevailing belief of the professional administrator organizations that the quality of superintendent and administrator preparation programs is seriously lacking (p. 127). Indeed, a new assessment for school superintendents (SSA) has been developed by the Education Testing Service (ETS) based on the ISLLC standards. "The ISLLC standards [for the superintendency] integrate AASA's performance standards and NCATE's standards for school administrators forged by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (NPBEA), a consortium of education associations (P. 128). It is too early to tell how many states will require such assessments in order for individuals to be licensed as superintendent. The trend in many states seems to be on relaxing the requirements so that non-educators can serve in the position (Mathews, 2001).

Nevertheless, weaknesses in university-based preparation programs identified in the *2000 Study of the Superintendency* included:

> the lack of hands-on application (19.8 percent); inadequate access to technology (18.9 percent); failure to link content to practice (16.5 percent); and too much emphasis on professors' personal experiences (13.8 percent) (p. 156).

It is interesting to note that the same areas of weakness were identified at almost the same levels of dissatisfaction in non-university based training (p. 160) illustrating that there is little difference between the two as they are presently operating. Yet criticism is leveled at schools of education for "not having the kind of pragmatic, action-oriented

program that provides needed skills and knowledge" (Hodgkinson & Montenegro, 1999, p. 20). Glass, Björk & Brunner (2000) conclude that:

> It is clear that both university- and non-university based professional preparation programs share similar weaknesses that emerge from similar constraints on the nature of delivery. They tend to be instructor-centered and class-room based (p. 161).

Recommendations for strengthening programs come out of noting the current deficiencies, then, and of predicting likely directions for superintendent growth. Without doubt, there is a consistent cry for closer association between higher education, the professional organizations and districts themselves to provide preparation outside conventional classroom settings (Bredeson, 2000; Glass, Björk & Brunner, 2000; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2001; Hodgkinson & Montenegro, 1999; Johnson, 1996; Kochan, 1999). In the future, preparation for the superintendency will be shaped inevitably by the extent to which the position changes – if it does change. There are many different conceptions of what the "new superintendency" should look like. Many seek to articulate a new approach in this current "era of ferment" (Murphy, 1999).

> The need to find a new foundation for the superintendency is a reflection of several converging factors: the demands for the organization of schooling to educate *all* students to high levels, (Larson and Ovando, 2001; public scrutiny of an intensely political post (Houston, 2001); perceived loss of depth in the candidate pools for the position (Glass, 2000; Houston, 1998); and increased

disruptive conflict between boards and superintendents (Bjork & Lindle, 2001) (Brunner, Grogan & Björk, in press).

New Conceptions of the Superintendency. Johnson (1996) makes the key point that in looking to a new superintendent for leadership, "school districts often ignore the leaders they already have – those teachers, administrators, and parents whose knowledge and investment in the district span the tenures of several superintendents" (p. 289). She highlights the importance of collaborative leadership for superintendents of the future if they are to facilitate lasting reform. This is a departure from the top-down, authoritarian approach that many traditional programs advocated in the past. Fortunately, the changing language of leadership itself reinforces this. The encouragement of distributed leadership throughout the organization (Elmore, 1999; Houston, 2001; Neuman & Simmons, 2000 cited in Brunner, Grogan & Björk, in press) emphasizes learning, and student growth and development rather than authority and control. Thus, superintendents must work with other stakeholders rather than manage them. A more positive concept of superintendent power, one that values the idea of "power with" instead of "power over" others is gaining favor especially to allow for greater community participation in educational decisions (Brunner, 2001). Superintendent candidates "most resembling heroic leaders may in fact be those least able to promote lasting change. Rather, their self-assured manner, confidant answers, and superior stance may actually generate resistance and quiet defiance, setting back the cause of reform"(Johnson, p. 289).

A new volume edited by Brunner and Bjork (in press) offers several ways to rethink the superintendency including more collaboration with communities, the creation of a

new balance between board members and the superintendent and a better grounding in justice and care. Grogan (2000) also advocates that superintendents pay more attention to the ethic of care as well as the capacity to work through others, to appreciate dissent, to be comfortable with contradiction and most important, to develop a critical awareness of how well children are being served. The themes of social justice run through many new conceptions of leadership. Murphy (1999) argues that social justice is one of the key notions providing a new anchor for the entire profession of educational administration. Others put forward related ideas of superintendents' learning to work more successfully with diverse communities for the welfare of students who have been less well served by traditional approaches to leadership (Carter & Cunningham, 1997; Larson & Ovando, 2001).

Goodman and Zimmerman (2001) recommend that superintendents and board members forge a stronger team. They posit five standards for the development of a unified governance and leadership team – vision, structure, accountability, advocacy and unity. These standards should be used as criteria for the self-evaluation of a team's performance (p. 11). Again, the board/superintendent team is urged "to create strong linkages with … community organizations and agencies … for the healthy development and high achievement of all children" (p.13). They argue that

> Sweeping changes are necessary in graduate programs that prepare superintendents. Such programs must include a strong focus on: community-wide collaborative leadership; high-level skills in school governance (especially in collaborative leadership with a board of education); teaching,

learning, and child development; and community and staff engagement (p. 18).

Houston (2001) describes the superintendency as a calling. His recipe for improved preparation is to "nurture and encourage" potential superintendents. Along with formal preparation programs then, he envisions a greater responsibility falling on current leaders to mentor the next generation of superintendents. This coincides with a proliferation of district based leadership programs nationwide. Many of these "grow your own programs" concentrate on filling assistant principal and principal positions. However, if the superintendency is seen as a logical progression from one position to the other, programs should expand to enrich the imaginations of those who have not necessarily thought about it.

There are reasons to encourage potential administrators to consider the superintendency as a career goal even as they are preparing for the assistant principalship. First, such programs give confidence to individuals to imagine themselves in the position of superintendent in the future. Preparing for the superintendency certainly includes the leadership preparation provided at every level. Linking the assistant principalship to the superintendency is an especially powerful source of encouragement for women who are not necessarily getting the same exposure to role models in the superintendency as men are. Second, the increase of non-educators in the position might not have the lasting effects on student learning that educators might have. In view of this trend, attracting educators to the position should be a priority of district leadership development programs. Johnson (1996) found that although sound management and skillful politics

enabled superintendents to meet the challenges of leading school districts, "being a proficient manager or an effective politician is not enough to carry a school district through sustained and meaningful change" (p. 290). Instead, superintendents must show evidence of pedagogical knowledge and understanding of teaching and learning. Therefore, partnerships between districts and universities are important for potential superintendents to learn how to conduct the day-to-day business of superintending as well as to gain the necessary research skills and scholarship to become reflective practitioners.

Recommendations. Thus, we continue to support the preparation of principals and superintendents in university-based programs for these harsh and demanding times. We are mindful that the changes in education, and the nation as a whole, could present an entirely different set of challenges in the future. Not withstanding this caveat, major research universities must continue to play an important role in the preparation of school leaders for the 21st century. However, the new conceptualization of school-site and district leadership as put forth by the academy and by NAESP, NASSP and AASA, requires something other than a traditional course delivery of knowledge, values or a compendium of skills. It calls into question the view that anyone can simply be given inert discipline-based knowledge and be an effective educational leader. Preparation must be redesigned to reflect the findings of research on the advancement of professional practice. As noted by Murphy (September, 1995) preparation programs must be reorganized to reflect what we have learned from large-scale school improvement efforts. Namely, the programs must attend to (1) belief, attitude and philosophy; (2) deal with problems in practice; and (3) foster institutional arrangements to allow for coordination

of efforts with schools. We recommend that programs for the preparation of aspiring school leaders be redesigned with the following characteristics in mind:

- Programs must be redesigned to reflect the collaborative instructional leader who works through transformational processes to conceptualize school-site or district leadership;

- The essential knowledge-base must be organized around the problems of practice, and delivered in collaboration with practitioners;

- Programs must be organized in such a way that there are opportunities for novices and experts to reflect while-in-action and reflect about action;

- Selection of aspiring principals and superintendents must be designed to admit a cohort group of diverse and talented professional educators who have already demonstrated skills as inquiring and reflective professionals and a deep commitment to social justice;

- Programs must contain developmental evaluation processes that assess the aspiring principals and superintendents based upon their level of development;

- Programs must be exemplary in the inclusion of the knowledge base as outlined in the ISLLC standards;

- Programs must be organized in such a way that the aspiring principals and superintendents understand their ethical and moral obligations to create schools that promote and deliver social justice;

- Programs should contain an intense year-long paid internship for both aspiring principals and aspiring superintendents in diverse settings; and

- Programs should have a critical mass of five to six faculty devoted to the preparation of new forms of leadership for the schools.

Clearly, the nation needs a new generation of school-site leaders and superintendents who have the ability to build shared vision and to never lose sight of that vision while working with others to make difficult day-to-day decisions necessary to create good schools for all of America's children. These professional educators must have the knowledge, understanding and skill to lead others by their beliefs about teaching and learning. Further, they must know how to stand for important ideas that make life meaningful for others in schools. These attributes are not what school leaders of tomorrow will need, but what all school leaders need today and what outstanding instructional leaders in many schools and districts already do on a daily basis in our cities, towns and rural communities.

References

Alexander, G. C., & Keller, L. (1994). Principals' observations of a state level project: Leadership to transform schools. *Journal of School Leadership, 4*, 254-271.

Amatea, E. S., Behar-Horenstein, L. S., & Sherrard, P. A. D. (1996). Creating school change: Discovering a choice of lenses for the school administrator. *Journal of Educational Administration, 34*(3), 49-64.

American Association of School Administrators and National School Boards Association. (1968). *Selecting a school superintendent.* Washington, D.C.

Andrews, R. L., Berube, B, & Basom , M. (1993) Not "Rambo", Not Hero: Principal as Designer, Teacher and Steward. *Educational Considerations 20*(2), 26-28.

Beck, L. J., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical themes, 1920s-1990s.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Björk, L. (1993). Effective schools – effective superintendents: The emerging instructional leadership role. *Journal of School Leadership 3*(3), 246-259.

Blase, J., & Blase, J. (1999). Principals' instructional leadership and teacher development: Teachers' perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(3), 349-378.

Blumberg, A. (1985). *The school superintendent: Living with conflict.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Boyd, W. (1974). The school superintendent: Educational statesman or political strategist? *Administrator's Notebook, 22*(9), 1-4.

Bratlein, M. & Walters, D. (1999). The superintendency: Preparing for multi-dimensional roles in complex and changing environments. In F. Kochan, B. Jackson & D.

Duke (Eds.), *A thousand voices from the firing line* (pp. 87-102). Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Bredeson, P. (2000), Foreword. In P. Short & J. Scribner (Eds.), *Case studies of the superintendency*. (pp. v-vi). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Bredeson, P. V. (1993). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructured schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 29*(1), 34-68.

Brunner, C. & Björk, L. (Eds.) (in press). *The new superintendency: Advances in research and theories of school management and educational policy.* Oxford: Elsevier Press.

Brunner, C. (2001, April). *Supporting social justice: Power and authentic participatory decision making in the superintendency*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Brunner, C., Grogan, M. & Björk, L. (in press). Shifts in the discourse defining the superintendency: Historical and current foundations of the position. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *NSSE Yearbook*.

Carter, G. & Cunningham, W. (1997). *The American school superintendent.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Conley, D. T., & Goldman, P. (1994). Facilitative leadership: How principals lead without dominating. *OSSC Bulletin, 37*(9).

Cooper, B. Fusarelli, L., & Carella, V. (2000). *Career crisis in the superintendency?* Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Crow, G. M., & Glascock, C. (1995). Socialization to a new conception of the principalship. *Journal of Educational Administration, 33*(1), 22-43.

Cuban, L. (1976). *Urban school chiefs under fire*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cunningham, W. & Sperry, J. (2001). The underpaid educator. *American School Board Journal* (April), 38-42.

Daresh, J. C., Gantner, M. W., Dunlap, K., & Hvizdak, M. (2000). Words from "the trenches": Principals' perspectives on effective school leadership characteristics. *Journal of School Leadership, 10,* 69-83.

Duignan, P., & Bhindi, N. (1997). Authenticity in leadership: An emerging perspective. *Journal of Educational Administration, 35*(3), 195-209.

Elmore, R. (September 1999). *Leadership of large-scale Improvement in American Education.* Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Ferrandino, V. (2001). Challenges for 21st-century elementary school principals, *Phi Delta Kappan 42*(6) 440-442.

Glass, T. (1997). The superintendency, yesterday, today and tomorrow. In C. Chapman (Ed.), *Becoming a superintendent: challenges of school district leadership* (pp. 19-39). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Glass, T., Björk, L., & Brunner, C.C. (2000). *The 2000 study of the American school superintendency*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Goodman, R & Zimmerman, W. (2000). *Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance and teamwork for high*

student achievement. Educational Research Service and New England School Development Council [On-line]. Available: http://www.nesdec.org/Thinking_Differently.htm

Griffith, J. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(2), 267-291.

Grogan, M. (2000). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist postmodern perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly 36*(1), 117-142.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 30*(3), 35-48.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 9*(2), 157-191.

Henkin, A. B., Wanat, C. L., & Davis, J. H. (1996). Social skills of principals: A profile in context. *Journal of School Leadership, 6*, 399-423.

Hodgkinson, H. & Montenegro, X. (1999). *The U.S. school superintendent: The invisible CEO*. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Johnson, S. M. (1996). *Leading to change: The challenge of the new superintendency*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kochan, F. (1999). A collage of voice and form: A summary of the findings. In F. Kochan, B. Jackson & D. Duke (Eds.), *A thousand voices from the firing line* (pp. 104-110). Columbia, MO: University Council for Educational Administration.

Kowalski, T. (1999). *The school superintendent: Theory, practice and cases*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Larson, C. & Ovando, C. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in multi-cultural school communities.* Belmont CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.

Leithwood, K., Tomlinson, D., & Genge, M. (1996). Transformational school leadership. In P. Hallinger (Ed.), *International handbook of educational leadership and administration* (Vol. 2, pp. 785-840). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lucas, S. (2001). *The effect of transformational principal and teacher leadership on school culture.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, December, 2000.

Marshall, C., Patterson, J. A., Rogers, D. L., & Steele, J. R. (1996). Caring as career: An alternative perspective for educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 32*(2), 271-294.

Mathews, J. (2001, June). Nontraditional thinking in the central office. In *The School Administrator Web Edition* [On-line]. Available: http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_06/feature_mathews1.htm.

Milstein, Mike M. (1993). *Changing the Way We Prepare Educational Leaders: The Danforth Experience.* Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

Murphy, J. (1999). *The quest for a center: Notes on the state of the profession of educational leadership.* Columbia, MO: The University Council for Educational Administration.

Murphy, Joseph (1995, September). Rethinking the Foundations of Leadership Preparation: Insights From School Improvements Efforts. *DESIGN for Leadership: The Bulletin of the National Policy Board for Educational Administration* (Vol. 6, No. 1).

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1998). Leadership as pedagogy, capital development and school effectiveness. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 1*(1), 37-46.

Short, E. C. (1994). When school leaders function as true educators: A review of key sources in the context of school renewal and restructuring. *Journal of School Leadership, 4,* 502-516.

Smith, W. F., & Andrews, R. L. (1989). *Instructional leadership: How principals make a difference.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Sternberg, R. (2001). The ultimate stress. *The School Administrator 58*(8), 6-13.

Tirozzi, G. (2001) The Artistry of leadership: the evolving role of the secondary school principal. *Phi Delta Kappan 42*(6), 434-439.

Young, M. (1999, April). *The leadership crisis in Iowa.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada.